

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the matter of:)
)
Implementation of the Telecommunications) CC Docket No. 96-115
Act of 1996;)
)
Telecommunication Carriers' Use of)
Customer Proprietary Network Information)
and Other Customer Information)
)
Implementation of the Local Competition) CC Docket No. 96-98
Provisions of the Telecommunications Act)
of 1996)
)
Provision of Directory Listing Information) CC Docket No. 99-273 ✓
Under the Communications Act of 1934,)
As Amended)

**MOTION OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.
TO ACCEPT LATE-FILED REPLY COMMENTS**

Pursuant to section 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.46, SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell, Nevada Bell, the Southern New England Telephone Company, and Ameritech Corporation (collectively "SBC") respectfully requests the Commission to accept late SBC's reply comments (a copy of which is attached hereto) in the above-captioned proceeding.¹ Due to problems with its contract courier, which were beyond SBC's control, SBC was unable to file its reply comments on time.

SBC engaged its contract courier to file the attached reply comments on the due date, Friday, January 21, 2000. The courier (who was newly hired by SBC's contractor)

¹ As noted below, SBC's contract courier filed SBC's reply comments one day late, on Monday, January 24, 2000. SBC did not learn that its courier failed to effect delivery on the due date, Friday, January 21, until late Monday.


picked up the reply comments well before the 7:00 p.m. filing deadline. However, the courier disregarded the instructions given to him by the courier service and failed to deliver the reply comments until sometime after 7:00 p.m.

On Monday, January 24, SBC contacted its contract courier to learn the whereabouts of the stamped, return copy of the reply comments. Late in the day on Monday, the courier service informed SBC that its courier did not file the reply comments on Friday. It further informed SBC that it had obtained the reply comments from its courier and filed them with the Commission on Monday. By the time SBC ascertained all the facts, it was too late in the day to prepare and file this motion with the Commission. SBC intended to file this motion on Tuesday, January 25, 2000, but was prevented from doing so because the Commission was closed due to inclement weather.

SBC certifies that it did not receive or review any of the other reply comments filed in this proceeding before its reply comments were filed on Monday, January 24, 2000. In fact, SBC served the attached reply comments on other parties to this proceeding on Friday, January 21, 2000. Accordingly, no other party to this proceeding will be prejudiced in any way by granting SBC a brief extension of time in which to file these reply comments.

For the foregoing reasons, SBC respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Accept Late-Filed Reply Comments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher M. Heimann", written over a horizontal line.

Christopher M. Heimann
Counsel for SBC Communications Inc.
1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 1020
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-326-3818

January 27, 2000

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the matter of:)	
)	
Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996;)	CC Docket No. 96-115
)	RECEIVED
Telecommunication Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information)	JAN 24 2000
)	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)	CC Docket No. 96-98
)	
Provision of Directory Listing Information Under the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended)	CC Docket No. 99-273
)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell, Nevada Bell, the Southern New England Telephone Company, and Ameritech Corporation (collectively "SBC") hereby reply to the oppositions of AT&T and INFONXX to SBC's petition for clarification or reconsideration of the Commission's *SLI Order*.¹

1. AT&T and INFONXX Misconstrue SBC's Petition.

In its Petition, SBC argued that, in light of the Commission's conclusion in the *UNE Remand Order* that ILECs need not provide unbundled access to OS/DA services,

¹ *Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-115, Second Order on Reconsideration of the Second Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-98, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-273, FCC 99-227 (rel. Sept. 9, 1999) ("*SLI Order*"). SBC notes that its petition for reconsideration was not listed in the Commission's public notice, released December 3, 1999, concerning the filing of petitions for reconsideration of the *SLI Order*. Consequently, it

LECs should not be required pursuant to section 251(b)(3) to unbundle all of the facilities used to provide DA services, and, in particular, adjunct features and software.² SBC did not suggest that competing carriers should be denied access to the DA information contained in LEC databases in a readily accessible electronic format, including daily updates.

AT&T's and INFONXX's oppositions misconstrue SBC's petition and thus oppose a request SBC did not make. In particular, both AT&T and INFONXX read SBC's petition as requesting that the Commission decline to require LECs to provide competing carriers access to directory assistance database listings.³ That, however, is not SBC's position. To the contrary, SBC agrees that, pursuant to section 251(b)(3), the Commission may require LECs to provide access to LEC OS/DA listings in electronic format (including daily updates) to the extent necessary to enable competing carriers to provide customers with DA listings, without dialing delays.

However, SBC does not agree that, pursuant to section 251(b)(3), the Commission can or should require all LECs to provide competing carriers unbundled access to all of the facilities (including ancillary services and software) used to provide DA services. As SBC pointed out in its petition, unbundling is the exclusive province of section 251(c)(3),

appears that AT&T's and INFONXX's oppositions are premature. Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, SBC replies to those oppositions here.

² SBC notes that, in its petition, it argued that the Commission should not require LECs to provide competing carriers access to their DA databases pursuant to section 251(b)(3) if it found that access to such databases was not required under section 251(c)(3). After SBC filed its petition for reconsideration, the Commission released the *UNE Remand Order*, in which it concluded that competitors are not impaired without access to ILEC OS/DA services because, *inter alia*, they can obtain nondiscriminatory access to all LECs's OS/DA, including OS/DA databases. *UNE Remand Order*, FCC 99-238 at para. 441-42. In light of this conclusion, SBC does not here challenge the right of competing carriers to obtain nondiscriminatory access to DA data or DA databases.

³ AT&T Opposition at 4; INFONXX Opposition at 3.

and is an obligation specifically limited to incumbent LECs. Moreover, it is an obligation that is specifically limited by the “necessary and impair” standard in section 251(d)(2). As such, the Commission may not require all LECs to provide unbundled access to all of the facilities used to provide DA services. Such a requirement plainly is inconsistent with the careful balance of obligations adopted in section 251.⁴

Having concluded that competing carriers are not impaired if they are denied access to ILEC’s OS/DA services, the Commission should not require LECs to provide unbundled access to ancillary OS/DA systems pursuant to section 251(b)(3). In the *UNE Remand Order*, the Commission found that competition for OS/DA services has existed since “divestiture,” and indeed has “accelerated.”⁵ The Commission further found the quality of “the functionality of third-party supplied OS/DA sufficiently equivalent to that of the incumbent’s service . . . that a requesting carrier’s ability to provide the services it seeks to offer is not impaired without access to the incumbent’s OS/DA service.”⁶ This competition has developed even though third-party providers have never obtained access to LEC ancillary services. As such, no credible claim can be made that competing carriers require access to ancillary proprietary OS/DA services and software to offer

⁴ Indeed, it would be ironic in the extreme if ILECs are not required to offer unbundled access to OS/DA under the more onerous provisions of section 251(c)(3), while all LECs are required to provide such access to ancillary proprietary OS/DA services and software pursuant to 251(b)(3).

⁵ *UNE Remand Order*, FCC 99-238 at para. 447.

⁶ *Id.* at p the Commission may only require unbundling pursuant to section 251(c)(3), and only where the necessary and impair standard in section 251(d)(2) is satisfied. And having concluded that competing carriers are not impaired without unbundled access to ILEC OS/DA, the Commission cannot require all LECs to unbundle all of their DA facilities pursuant to section 251(b)(3). Accordingly, the Commission should clarify that, while LECs must provide competing LECs nondiscriminatory access to DA data in an electronic format (including through daily updates), they need not provide unbundled access to all DA facilities, and, in particular, adjunct features.ara. 456.

OS/DA service, or that competing carriers would be denied dialing parity without access to such services and software.

Accordingly, SBC urges the Commission to clarify that LECs are not required to provide access to ancillary OS/DA services and software that are separate from their OS/DA databases and which they use to facilitate their utilization of those databases. Granting this request will not deny competing carriers access to the information and facilities they need (including subscriber list information and directory assistance listings, either in bulk or via direct access to the DA database) to obtain dialing parity or provide competing DA services.

2. SBC Supports the Petitions of Bell Atlantic and US West and the Comments Supporting Them.

Several local exchange carriers ("LECs") and publishers filed Petitions for Clarification or Reconsideration of the *SLI Order* that were itemized in the Commission Public Notice released on December 3, 1999. Although SBC did not comment on these petitions, it does support the Petitions filed by Bell Atlantic and US West. SBC also agrees with the Comments filed by BellSouth, GTE, Yellow Pages Publishers Association and others in support of those Petitions. In particular, SBC agrees with the following positions articulated in the petitions and comments:

1. It currently infeasible, unnecessary and unduly burdensome to require LECs to separately notify publishers of changes in a subscriber's listing from listed to non-listed status. SBC's current subscriber listing systems, procedures and practices do not enable SBC to separately provide changes to list status, and it would be very costly and administratively burdensome to create that capability. SBC already provides updates to list status, along with new, changed and deleted listings, in its daily updates. This process is consistent with end users' desires to be listed -- or not listed -- accurately.

2. LECs should be able to charge for all listings they in fact provide using their existing systems, even where the publishers have requested fewer listings, since the LEC incurs costs associated with each listing it provides.
3. In order to protect consumers, the Commission should provide a more effective mechanism for preventing and remedying unauthorized use of customer subscriber list information by publishers.
4. Contracts with publishers should only be disclosed subject to an appropriate confidentiality agreement.


SBC will not repeat the arguments made by the other LECs and publishers in support of these positions, but rather adopts and incorporates them herein by reference.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, SBC urges the Commission to clarify that LECs need not provide access to OS/DA ancillary services and software, which is not needed to provide competitive OS/DA services or to achieve dialing parity. The Commission also should grant the Petitions of Bell Atlantic and US West.

Respectfully submitted,
SBC COMMUNICATIONS Inc.

By:



Alfred G. Richter, Jr.
Roger K. Toppins
Christopher Heimann
Counsel for SBC Communications Inc.
One Bell Plaza, Room 3008
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 464-4244

Date: January 21, 2000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anisa A. Latif, do hereby certify that a copy of **SBC Communications, Inc., Reply Comments** has been served on the parties attached via first class mail – postage prepaid on this 21st day of January 2000.

By: Anisa A. Latif
Anisa A. Latif

Mark C. Rosenblum Roy E. Hoffinger
James H. Bolin
AT&T
295 North Maple Ave. Room 1130M1
Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920

M. Robert Sutherland
A. Kirvin Gilbert III
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree St. NW Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Gregory J. Vogt Kenneth J. Krisko
Nicole M. McGinnis
Wiley Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Joel Bernstein
Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Maher
555 12th Street, NW
Suite 950 North
Washington, DC 20004

Jonathan Askin
Vice President
ALTS
888 17th Street, NW Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006-3307

Philip L. Verveer Theodore Whitehouse
Sophie J. Keefer
Wilhie, Farr & Gallagher
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036-3384

Stuart Polikoff
OPASTCO
21 Dupont Circle, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Gerald J. Waldron Mary N. Williams
Russell Jessee
Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
P.O. Box 7566
Washington, DC 20044

John M. Goodman
Bell Atlantic
1300 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Kathryn M. Krause
U.S. West, Inc.
1801 California Street
Suite 5100
Denver, CO 80202

Margot S. Humphrey
Koteen & Naftalin
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036-4104

Robert M. McDowell
Competitive Telecommunications Assn.
1900 M Street, NW Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3508

L. Marie Guillory
Daniel Mitchell
National Telephone Cooperative Assn.
4121 Wilson Blvd 10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1801

Charles C. Hunter
Catherine M. Hannan
Hunter Communications Law Group, P.C.
1620 Eye Street, NW Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006

Certificate of Service

I, Toni R. Acton, do hereby certify that a copy of Motion of SBC Communications, Inc. to Accept Late-Filed Reply Comments has been served on the parties on the attached service list via first-class mail, postage prepaid, on this 27th day of January 2000.

By: 
Toni R. Acton

Mark C. Rosenblum
Roy E. Hoffinger
James H. Bolin
AT&T
295 North Maple Avenue
Room 1130M1
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

M. Robert Sutherland
A. Kirvin Gilbert III
Bellsouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30390-3610

Gregory J. Vogt
Kenneth J. Krisko
Nicole M. McGinnis
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Joel Bernstein
Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Maher
555 12th Street, NW
Suite 950 North
Washington, DC 20004

Jonathan Askin, Vice President
ALTS
888 17th Street, NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006

Philip L. Verveer
Theodore Whitehouse
Sophie J. Keefer
Willkie, Farr & Gallagher
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Stuart Polikoff
OPASTCO
21 Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Gerald J. Waldron
Mary Williams
Russell Jessee
Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
P.O.Box 7566
Washington, DC 20044

John M. Goodman
Bell Atlantic
1300 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Kathryn M. Krause
US West, Inc.
1801 California Street
Suite 5100
Denver, CO 80202

Margot S. Humphrey
Koteen & Naftalin
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036

Robert M. McDowell
Competitive Telecommunications Association
1900 M Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

L. Marie Guillory
Daniel Mitchell
National Telephone Cooperative Association
4121 Wilson Blvd
10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203

Charles C. Hunter
Catherine M. Hannan
Hunter Communications Law Group, P.C.
1620 Eye Street, NW
Suite 701
Washington, DC 20006